UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/005,583	10/26/2001	Brett A. Green	10013478-1	8143
	7590 07/01/200 CKARD COMPANY	EXAMINER		
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			PAULA, CESAR B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/01/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM mkraft@hp.com ipa.mail@hp.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/005,583	GREEN, BRETT A.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
CESAR B. PAULA	2178	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on t	the cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED <u>09 June 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION	ON IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the sam application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.11 periods: 	(1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires months from the mailing date of t	he final rejection.
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than	ction, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	the mellion and a 07 OFD 4 400(a) and the amount of a density for
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension at under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than thre may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	nd the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance w	ith 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the AMENDMENTS	
3. 🛛 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior	to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) They raise new issues that would require further considerati	
(b) \square They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);	
(c) ☑ They are not deemed to place the application in better form appeal; and/or	for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a correspo	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 4	• • • •
4. 🔲 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See	attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable non-allowable claim(s). 	
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will n how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided bel The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1,4-8,17,19,20,24 and 25.	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficie was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and wa	e <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the s REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	status of the claims after entry is below or attached.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does N	OT place the application in condition for allowance because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SE 13. Other:	3/08) Paper No(s)
	/CESAR B PAULA/
	Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Regarding claim 1, the Applicant submits that Os does not disclose or suggest uploading character recognition application from a scanner to a computer (page 6, last parag.). Olbricht teaches the sending of an html page from a server, in a scanner, to a client computer. The page contains a set of configuration parameters, and functions to perform various operations on the scanner, such as previewing the document to be scanned, scanning the document, etc. The functions in page are Java applets, which provide the various scanning functionalities (col.2, lines 42-67, col.4,lines 8-16, fig.1-2). Olbricht fails to teach that the applets contain ocr functionality. However, Os discloses automatically performing optical character recognition on a scanned document when received from a scanner (col.7, line 43-col.8, line 20, col.3, lines 56-67, fig.4). It would lit would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Olbricht and Os before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the method taught by Olbricht to include performing optical character recognition on the html page downloaded to the client computer browser, because of all the reasons taught by Olbricht, such as transforming the image document into a format usable by the browser (col.2, lines 57-63), and Os's teaching, which includes automatically configuring the operation of the scanner in a manner that requires significantly less user intervention(col.3, lines 27-34). This would also enhance the functionality available to the client user, since it would enable the quick conversion and editing on the client of the scanned document..

Claims 4-5, 7-8, 17, 19-20, and 24-25 are rejected at least based on the rationale laid out above.